



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLI, 1.

WHOLE No. 161

I.—THE LITERARY TRADITION OF GYGES AND CANDAULES.¹

Some years ago I contributed to this Journal (XXIII 261-282; 362-387)² an article in which I undertook to reconstruct the plot of a popular tale of Gyges and the King of Lydia which appears to have been still current in the period of Herodotus and Plato. In the process of my investigation, which I carried as far as the fall of the Eastern Empire, it became more and more evident that the most notable feature of the later tradition of Gyges and Candaules was the increasing preponderance in it of the two versions by Herodotus and Plato respectively. The matter had no bearing upon the subject which I was then discussing, and I therefore mentioned it only in passing. But the fact itself is so characteristic of ancient literary tradition as such, and in some ways is so striking a commentary upon it, that it seems worthy of special consideration.

Let us begin with the later tradition of Plato's story of Gyges and his Ring (Republic 359 D). It will be remembered that in this passage the spokesman, discussing the well-known doctrine that the only thing which prevents even the best of us from doing wrong in the end is the fear of detection, asserts that his point would be proved if both a good and a bad man could be given some power which would render detection impossible. "I

¹ This article was transmitted to the JOURNAL a few hours before the author's death, and so did not have the benefit of his final revision.—Ed.

² My investigation did not concern itself with the ultimate origin, meaning or credibility of the various accounts. For these points the best and most recent authority is Lehmann-Haupt, PRE s. v. Gyges.

mean," he says, "such a power . . . as they say was once possessed by the ancestor of the Lydian." Then by way of at once enforcing his point and explaining his reference, he tells the story in question. When he returns to the story at 612 B Plato couples the ring of Gyges with another more ancient and more famous method of going invisible, the Homeric *"Αἶδος κινέη* or Hades' "Cap of Darkness."

A brief and interesting story told by a master and in his best style, a story with a moral, above all a story with a literary reference (*Γύγον δακτύλιος*) which could be used to great advantage by writers and speakers—so far as rhetoricians were concerned, here, as the old translator of Bayle says of books of extracts, was "meat already chewed." Nevertheless, we hear nothing of the story until Cicero (*Off.* III 9, 38) translates it in connection with his discussion of the same question of conduct. And strange to say I have been unable to find a single reference in any other Roman author.³

Even on the Greek side I find no mention of this story until Ptolemaeus Chennus (*Myth. Graeci*, p. 192 W) at the end of the first century of our era. Chennus was a sort of purveyor in ordinary to the literary chit-chat so characteristic of that period. As such he can tell us, for example, why the Queen was able to see Gyges in spite of his ring. She had a double pupil, also a dragon-stone. This shows of course that the literary world was on the whole quite well aware of the relation between the story of Plato and the story of Herodotus. Such a book as the *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae* of the Elder Seneca, not to mention a number of others, is enough in itself to show that in practically every instance the source and associations of these semi-popular literary discussions were scholastic. It is fair, therefore, to assume that our passage in Plato had already been familiar to the Rhetorical Schools for a long time. However that may be, we know that it had entered them at least as early as the First Sophistic Renaissance. This we learn from the *Progymnasmata* of Theon, one of the most notable figures in the educational life of that period.

In the second chapter of this text-book (*Rhet. Graeci*, I 159

³ In N. H. XXXIII 8, *Midæ quidem anulum, quo circumactō habentem nemo cerneret, quis non etiam fabulosiorem fateatur?* Pliny was hardly thinking of Plato's story; see A. J. P. XXIII 273.

Walz) for the use of students and teachers, Theon recommends and in some cases discusses those passages from the great classical authors which every schoolboy was expected to learn by heart. These passages were selected and graded according to the age and training of the student, and for the most part fall into three classes: 1. anecdotes (χρεῖαι), 2. fables (μῦθοι), 3. stories (διηγήσεις)—these last being again subdivided into mythical stories and stories of actual fact. Under the first subdivision (διηγήσεις μυθικαί) four examples are recommended:

Διηγήσεως δὲ παραδείγματα ἂν εἴη κάλλιστα, τῶν μὲν μυθικῶν ἡ Πλάτωνος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς πολιτείας περὶ τοῦ δακτυλίου τοῦ Γύγου · καὶ ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ ἔρωτος · περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν Ἄιδου, ἐν τῷ Φαίδωνι, καὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ τῆς πολιτείας · καὶ παρὰ Θεοπόμπῃ ἐν τῇ ὁγδόῃ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ἡ τοῦ σελίνου.

It will be observed that the very first of these passages is Plato's story. Is it at all surprising to discover that the Ring of Gyges suddenly becomes prominent in the writers of this particular period? We shall also find a practically unbroken tradition of its use as a literary reference until the fall of the Eastern Empire.

In his *Bis Accusatus* 21, Lucian makes Epicurus say, in his plea for pleasure as against the claims of the Stoa, that these apostles of toil and efficiency

"Cannot bear to be detected in any relaxation, or any departure from their principles: but, poor men, they lead a Tantalus' life of it in consequence, and when they do get a chance of sinning without being found out, they drink down pleasure by the bucketful. Depend on it, if some one would make them a present of Gyges's ring of invisibility, or Hades's cap, they would cut the acquaintance of toil without further ceremony, and elbow their way into the presence of Pleasure."

Again in the *Navigium* 42, Timolaus is made to say

"My wish is that Hermes should appear and present me with certain rings, possessed of certain powers. One should ensure its wearer continual health and strength, invulnerability, insensibility to pain. Another, like that of Gyges, should make me invisible."

Epist. Graec. p. 619, 43 Didot (*Æschines* to *Xenophon*) we have:

κἂν πολλάκις περικρύπτηται περιθέμενος τὴν Ἄιδου κυνὴν ἢ τὸν Γύγου δακτύλιον καὶ δίκας γράφεται τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει · ζῇ γὰρ ἀπὸ βυρσοδεμικῆς.

Libanius, Orat. LVI (Contra Lucianum), 10 says:

ἀλλ' ὡς ἡδαιμεν χάριν μᾶλλον ὄψιν ἡδίστην θεώμενοι, Λουκιανὸν ἀσθενῆ καὶ ζητοῦντα τὴν ἀρχήν, οὐκ ἔχοντα, ἃ χρὴν οὐκ αὐτὸν ἐνθυμούμενον, κλέψαι τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν εἴσοδον, ἐπεὶ μὴ πρίασθαί γε ἐξῆν ποθεν τὸν Γύγου δακτυλίον ἢ μισθωσάμενον γοητεῖαν ὑπὸ τοῖς ἐκείνης μαγγανεύμασι δραμεῖν.

Again, Orat. LXIV (Pro Saltat.) 35, he says:

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις, εἰ μή, νῆ Δία γε, τὴν Ἄιδος κυνῆν, ἣ τὸν Γύγου δακτυλίον ἔχοντες ἀδικοῦσιν, ὑφ' ὧν λανθάνουσιν.

And finally in his Epistles 1031, we have (as quoted by L.-S. Paroem. Graec. II, p. 20) :

σὺ δ' οὔτω μετὰ τοῦ δακτυλίου τοῦ Γύγου πάντα δρῶν λανθάνειν.

The use of the phrase by Gregory of Nazianzus is glib but evidently quite mechanical; cp. Orat. Contra Julianum (35, p. 628 Migne) :

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἑαυτὸν ἀποκρύψει, οὐδ' ἂν πολλὰ στραφῇ καὶ παντοῖος γένηται ταῖς ἐπινοαίαις, οὐδ' εἰ τὴν Ἄιδος κυνῆν, ὃ δὴ λέγεται, περιθήμενος ἢ τῷ δακτυλίῳ Γύγου, καὶ τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης χρησάμενος, ἑαυτὸν ἀποκλέψει, etc. : Orat. 43, 21 (L. and S., Paroem. Graeci, I, p. 21), ᾧ πλέον ἐφρονοῦμεν ἢ τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης ὁ Γύγης, εἴπερ μὴ μῦθος ἦν, ἐξ ἧς Λυδῶν ἐτυράννησεν : Carmina, Lib. I, 2, 30 (37, p. 685 Migne),

κέρδος τοσοῦτον κἂν τρέχεν ὄρους δοκῆς,
κἂν σοι τὰ Γύγου τοῦ πολυχρύσου παρῇ
στρέφῃς τε πάντα τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης
σιγῶν δυνάστης, etc.

The emphasis which Gregory lays on *σφενδόνη* indicates in itself that this old word used by Plato for the bezel of a ring had long been obsolete or obsolescent.

Doubtless the hereditary reference to Gyges' Ring occurs here and there in the huge Corpus of Greek Fathers edited by Migne—one would expect it for instance to be used by such a firebrand of rhetoric as Joannes Chrysostomus—but I have made no effort to examine this field systematically.

That the phrase continued to live, however, and to be used more or less frequently, is shown among other things by the frequency of its occurrence in the Paroemiographi Graeci, cp. Apostolius 5, 71 (P. G. 2, 353) ; Macarius, 3, 9 (P. G. 2, 154) ; Diogenianus, 3, 99 (P. G. 1, 232 and 2, 20) ; Greg. Cyp. 2, 5 (P. G. 1, 358).

So much for the later literary reference to Gyges' Ring. Among the authors whose interest in the story evidently went beyond the mere phrase which we have been discussing, the most notable is Philostratus. In the *Heroicus*, 2, 137, 29 sqq., he gives a brief rhetorical version of the old story, as follows:

Καὶ μὴν, εἰ μυθολογικὸς ἦν, τὸν τε τοῦ Ὀρέστου νεκρὸν διΐην ἄν, ὃν ἐπτάπηχυν ἐν Νεμέᾳ Λακεδαιμόνιοι εὐρον, καὶ τὸν ἐν τῷ χαλκῷ ἵππῳ τῷ Λυδῷ ὃς κατωρώρυκτο μὲν ἐν Λυδίᾳ πρὸ Γύγου ἔτι, σεισμῷ δὲ τῆς γῆς διασχούσης θαῦμα τοῖς περὶ Λυδίαν ὥφθη ποιμέσιν, οἷς ἅμα ὁ Γύγης ἐθήτευσεν. ἐς γὰρ κοῖλον τὸν ἵππον θυρίδας ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ πλευρᾷ ἔχοντα νεκρὸς ἀπέκειτο μείζων ἢ ἀνθρώπου δόξαι.

In his life of Apollonius of Tyana, III 8, describing how the wonderful Indian dragons are hunted, he says:

κοκκοβαφεῖ πέπλῳ χρυσᾷ ἐνείραντες γράμματα τίθενται πρὸ τῆς χεῖρας ἵππον ἐγγοητεύσαντες τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὑφ' οὗ νικᾶται τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς ὁ δράκων ἀτρέπτους ὄντας, καὶ πολλὰ τῆς ἀπορρήτου σοφίας ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἄδουσιν, οἷς ἄγεται τε καὶ τὸν αὐχένα ὑπερβαλὼν τῆς χεῖρας ἐπικαθεύδει τοῖς γράμμασι. προσπεσόντες οὖν οἱ Ἴνδοι κειμένῳ πελέκεις ἐναράττονσι, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμόντες λήζονται τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ λίθους. ἀποκείσθαι δὲ φασιν ἐν ταῖς τῶν ὀρέων δρακόντων κεφαλαῖς λίθους τὸ μὲν εἶδος ἀνθρώπου καὶ πάντα ἀπαυγαζούσας χρώματα, τὴν δὲ ἰσχὺν ἀρρήτους κατὰ τὸν δακτύλιον, ὃν γενέσθαι φασὶ τῷ Γύγῃ.⁴

Of the passages remaining to be considered some are merely notes designed to explain the reference to Gyges' Ring, others are rhetorical abstracts, all are directly due to the scholastic tradition.

The story, for instance, is told by Nonnus in his note on Gregory of Nazianzus, *Invect.* 1, 55 (text in Westermann's *Mythographi*, p. 366, XVI) as follows:

Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐν πολιτείᾳς (ἔστι δὲ οὕτως αὐτοῦ λεγομένη πραγματεία) εἰσφέρει τὸν μῦθον τοῦτον, οὕτω λέγων, ὅτι Γύγης ἦν τις ποιμὴν περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν· οὗτος ποιμαίνων ἐν τινι ὄρει τὰ πρόβατα περιέτυχε σπηλαίῳ τινί, καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐτῷ εὗρεν ἵππον χαλκοῦν καὶ ἔδον τοῦ χαλκοῦ ἵππου ἄνθρωπον νεκρὸν καὶ δακτύλιον· οὗ δακτυλίου ἡ κεφαλὴ στρεπτή ἦν καὶ ἐστρέφετο. ἔλαβεν οὖν ὁ Γύγης τὸν δακτύλιον καὶ ἐξήλθε· καὶ ἥνικα μὲν ἦν ἐν τῇ τάξει ὁ δακτύλιος, ἐωρᾶτο ὑπὸ πάντων, ἥνικα δὲ τὴν σφενδόνην τοῦ δακτυλίου ἔστρεφεν, ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο πᾶσιν. ὁ οὖν Πλάτων εἰσφέρει τὸν μῦθον τοῦτον, ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἀνὴρ, κὰν τοῦ Γύγου λάβῃ δακτύλιον, ἵνα μὴ ὁράται ὑπὸ τινος, οὐδ' οὕτως

⁴ In my article on Gyges, *A. J. P.* XXIII 370, I somehow managed to translate κατὰ τὸν δακτύλιον, "even against the ring," as though it were a genitive instead of an accusative, "according to the ring."

ᾧφειλεν ἀδικεῖν · δεῖ γὰρ τὸ καλὸν δι' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτηδεύειν καὶ μὴ δι' ἄλλους τινάς.

Nonnus practically repeats the same note in his commentary on Gregory, Orat. in Basil. 5.

Poor old Ioannes Tzetzes, at the dawn of the Renaissance—a man who would have been a distinguished scholar if he had had half a chance—was especially interested in our two passages and saw more or less clearly the original relation between them. His *Chiliades* is now so rare a book that I quote here in full the passages in point:

Chiliades I 137-166:

Γύγης τὸ πρότερον ποιμὴν κατὰ τινας ὑπάρχων,
Ποιμαίνων εὐρέ που χαλκοῦν ἵππον ἐγκεχωσμένον,
Εἰς ὄνπερ ἵππον ἐνδοθὶ νεκρὸς τις κεκλιμένος
Στρεπτὸν περὶ τὸν δάκτυλον δακτύλιον ἐφόρει.
Τούτου γοῦν τὸν δακτύλιον οὗτος λαβὼν ὁ Γύγης
Καὶ γνοὺς ὡς ἔχει δύναμιν, σφενδόνης στρεφομένης,
Συγκρύπτει τὸν κατέχοντα καὶ πάλιν ἐμφανίζειν,
Κτεῖνας Κανδαύλην ἔλαβε Λυδῶν τὴν βασιλείαν.

Ἡρόδοτος τὸν Γύγην δὲ ποιμένα μὲν οὐ λέγει,
Υἱὸν Δασκύλου δέ φησιν, ὑπασπιστὴν Κανδαύλου ·

*Ὅστις Κανδαύλης γυναικὸς ἔρον οἰκεῖας τρέφων
Γυμνὴν αὐτὴν ὑπέδειξε τῷ Γύγῃ λεληθότως.

Ἡ δὲ καὶ γνοῦσα σιωπᾷ, εἶτα καλεῖ τὸν Γύγην,
Αἶρεσιν λέγουσα λαβὲ Γύγῃ τῶν δύο μίαν,

*Ἡ σὺ Κανδαύλην ἀνελὲν ἢ φονευθῆναι τούτῳ.

Γυμνὴ δυσὶν ἀνδράσι γὰρ οὐ στέγω θεαθῆναι.

Οὕτω Κανδαύλην ἀνελὼν εἶλε τὴν βασιλείαν.

*Ἐκ τῆς Κανδαύλου γυναικὸς Ἄρδους υἱὸς τῷ Γύγῃ,

*Ἄρδους Σαδυάττης δέ, καὶ τούτου Ἄλυάττης,

*Ἐξ Ἄλυάττου Κροῖσος δέ, ὅστις ἡττᾶται Κύρῳ.

*Ἀλλ' ἤδη σε σφαδάζοντα καὶ κεχηνότα βλέπω,

Τὴν Γύγου χριζόντα μαθεῖν πᾶσαν ἀλληγορίαν.

Ποιμὴν ὁ Γύγης λέγεται τῷ στρατηγὸς τυγχάνειν ·

*Ἴππος χαλκοῦς ἀγέρωχός ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία,

Ναὶ μὴν καὶ τὰ ἀνάκτορα · νεκρός, γυνὴ Κανδαύλου,

Τῶν ἀνακτόρων ἀπρακτός ἐνδοθεν καθημένη.

*Ἦς τὸν δακτύλιον λαβὼν ὑπασπισταῖς δεικνύει,

Καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀπέκτεινε λαθραίως τὸν Κανδαύλην.

Στρέφας δὲ τὸν δακτύλιον πάλιν πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα

Γίνεται πᾶσιν ἐμφανής, λαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν.

Id. VI 481-484:

Νυσσία οὖσα σύζυγος Μυρτίλου τοῦ Κανδαύλου ·

Τὸ δὲ Κανδαύλης Λυδικῶς τὸν σκυλοπνίκτην λέγει ·

Ἐπεὶ Κανδαύλης ἔδειξε γυμνὴν αὐτὴν τῷ Γύγῃ,
Κτανεῖν τὸν Γύγην ἔπεισεν αὐτῆς τὸν συνευνέτην.

Id. VII 195-202 :

Γυμνὴν Κανδαύλης ἔδειξε τῷ Γύγῃ σφὴν γυναῖκα ·
Ἦτις καὶ συγκαλέσασα τὸν Γύγην κατιδίαν
Δίδωσι τὸν δακτύλιον αὐτῆς, ὥς ἀποκτείνει
Κανδαίλῃν ταύτης σύζυγον, δείξας κρυφῇ συμμάχους.
Οὗ γεγονότος κτείνας τε λαθραίως τὸν Κανδαύλῃν
Καὶ στρέφας τὸν δακτύλιον πάλιν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα,
Γίνεται πᾶσιν ἐμφανὴς λαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν.
Ἐχeis ἐν πρώτῳ πίνακι τρίτην τὴν ἱστορίαν.

Last of all, we have the following account in the so-called Violarium of Eudocia (now considered the work of some scholar of the Renaissance), 247 :

Γύγην οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐμυθεύοντο τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης, ἣν ἐφόρει, ἀφανίζεσθαι καὶ μὴ ὁρᾶσθαι παρόντα καὶ εἰς ὄψιν ἔρχεσθαι · ὃν καὶ Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐν Πολιτείᾳ εἰσφέρει μυθικῶς οὕτω λέγων, ὅτι Γύγης τις ἦν ποιμὴν περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν. οὗτος ποιμαίνων ἐν τινι ὄρει τὰ πρόβατα περιέτυχε σπηλαίῳ τινί. καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐτῷ εὗρεν ἵππον χαλκοῦν, καὶ ἔνδον τοῦ χαλκοῦ ἵππου νεκρὸν ἄνθρωπον φοροῦντα δακτύλιον, οὗ δακτυλίου ἡ κεφαλὴ στρεπτὴ ἦν καὶ ἐστρέφετο · ἥτις σφενδόνη ἐκαλεῖτο. ἔλαβεν οὖν ὁ Γύγης τὸν δακτύλιον, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν. καὶ ἡνίκα μὲν ἦν ἐν τῇ τάξει ὁ δακτύλιος, ἐωρᾶτο ὑπὸ πάντων, ἡνίκα δὲ τὴν σφενδόνην τοῦ δακτυλίου ἔστρεφεν, ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο ἐν πᾶσιν. ὁ οὖν Πλάτων εἰσφέρει τὸν μῦθον τοῦτον, ὅτι, φησὶν, ὁ δίκαιος ἀνὴρ, κἂν τοῦ Γύγου λάβῃ τὸν δακτύλιον, ἵνα μὴ ὁρᾶται ὑπὸ τίνος, οὐδὲ οὕτως ὀφείλει ἀδικεῖν. δεῖ γὰρ τὸ καλὸν δι' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτηδεύεσθαι, καὶ μὴ δι' ἄλλο τι. ἔχων οὖν ὁ Γύγης τοῦτον τὸν δακτύλιον, ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τὰ βασιλεια τῶν Λυδῶν καὶ ἀντιστρέφας τὴν σφενδόνην ἐγένετο ἀφανὴς. καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἀπέκτεινε τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἔλαβε τὴν βασιλείαν. διὸ καὶ Γύγου δακτύλιος ἐπὶ τῶν πολυμυχανῶν καὶ πανούργων λέγεται. ὁ δὲ Ἡρόδοτος ἄλλως ἱστορεῖ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Γύγην, ὅτι ἐπιτροπῇ τῆς δεσποίνης ἀπέκτεινε τὸν Κανδαίλῃν ὁ Γύγης καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν.

It will be seen that this note was written entirely for practical purposes. The author explains the Platonic application and points out the origin and meaning of the familiar proverb. He is not affected by the allegorizing of Tzetzes, but on the other hand he also seems to have been sufficiently modern to have quite lost track of the good old tradition, as we saw it for instance in Chennus and Philostratus, according to which Plato and Herodotus really go back ultimately to a common source.

As we look back over this sometimes thin but always persistent literary tradition of more than a millennium, the most notable

feature of it is the fact that with the possible exception of Cicero's translation, I have been unable to find a single reference which does not go back either directly or indirectly to the school-house. There is something portentous in the length, the strength and the persistence of such a pedagogical tradition. Fancy our "eminent educators" allowing anything, no matter what it was, to remain in the schools for more than thirty generations! It would be hasty, however, to assume that this extraordinary conservatism was entirely due to the fact that no one had the brains or the energy to think of anything new or better. It was a long, long time before the Imperial system of education ceased to be distinctly superior in its own particular way to that of any other nation or period.

Finally, it may be worth observing that apart from the translation of Cicero already mentioned, I find no reference to Gyges' Ring, no sign of familiarity with the story of it, in the entire range of Latin literature. One would have guessed that the paramount authority of a writer like Cicero would have given his version the entrée of the Roman schools. But this does not seem to have been the case.

Let us now investigate and test in the same manner the later tradition of the story told by Herodotus. This, too, begins with Rhetoric. The first, and one of the most important references now surviving, belongs to the Age of Augustus. It is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Compositione Verborum*, § 16.

The author's main object and the point which he especially desires to make is (§ 9) that "it is upon arrangement, far more than upon selection, that persuasion, charm, and literary power depend."⁵ "Every utterance," he continues (§§ 11 sqq.), "by which we express our thoughts is either in metre or not in metre. Whichever it be, it can, when aided by beautiful arrangement, attain beauty whether of verse or prose. But speech, if flung out carelessly at random, at the same time spoils the value of the thought. Many poets and prose writers (philosophers and orators) have carefully chosen expressions that are distinctly beautiful and appropriate to the subject matter, but have reaped no benefit from their trouble because they have given them a rude and haphazard sort of arrangement: whereas others have invested their discourse with great beauty by taking humble, unpretending words, and arranging them with charm and dis-

⁵ The translation in this and the following sections is that of Roberts.

tion. It may well be thought that composition is to selection what words are to ideas. For just as a fine thought is of no avail unless it be clothed in beautiful language, so here, too, pure and elegant expression is useless unless it be attired in the right vesture of arrangement.

"But to guard myself against the appearance of making an unsupported assertion, I will try to show by an appeal to facts the reasons which have convinced me that composition is a more important and effective art than mere selection of words. I will first examine a few specimen passages in verse and prose. Among poets let Homer be taken, among prose-writers Herodotus: from these may be formed an adequate notion of the rest. . . .

"There is in Herodotus a certain Lydian king whom he calls Candaules, adding that he was called Myrsilus by the Greeks. Candaules is represented as infatuated with admiration of his wife, and then as insisting on one of his friends seeing the poor woman naked. The friend struggled hard against the constraint put upon him; but failing to shake the king's resolve, he submitted, and viewed her. The incident, as an incident, is not only lacking in dignity and, for the purpose of embellishment, intractable, but is also vulgar and hazardous and more akin to the repulsive than to the beautiful. But it has been related with great dexterity: it has been made something far better to hear told than it was to see done. And, that no one may imagine that it is to the dialect that the charm of the story is due, I will change its distinctive forms into Attic, and without any further meddling with the language will give the conversation as it stands."

Dionysius then rewrites Herodotus I 8-10 (Γύγη, οὐ γάρ σε . . .
ὁ μὲν δὴ ὡς οὐκ ἐδύνατο διαφυγεῖν, ἔτοιμος ἦν) in Attic and continues:

"Here again no one can say that the grace of the style is due to the impressiveness and the dignity of the words. These have not been picked and chosen with studious care; they are simply the labels affixed to things by Nature. Indeed, it would perhaps have been out of place to use other and grander words. I take it, in fact, to be always necessary, whenever ideas are expressed in proper and appropriate language, that no word should be more dignified than the nature of the ideas. That there is no stately or grandiose word in the present passage, any one who likes may prove by simply changing the arrangement. There are many similar passages in this author, from which it can be seen that the fascination of his style does not after all lie in the beauty of the words but in their combination."⁶

*"The truth seems to be," says Roberts in an interesting passage

For the purposes of our present inquiry this discussion of Dionysius is very instructive. We may almost begin with the assumption that this passage of Herodotus had already been associated with scholastic rhetoric for an indefinite period. Otherwise a man of the type and time of Dionysius would hardly have used it as an illustration in a technical treatise on rhetoric. By the time of Augustus, the examples and illustrations used by the rhetoricians were for the most part veterans in the service. That this was actually the case with this particular passage is suggested for one thing by the fact that it is such an extraordinarily good example of the *λέξις εἰρομένη*. And the well-known passage in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (3, 9) in which the author discusses and characterizes the two great types of composition, indicates that even then Herodotus had become the classic of that type. If now we add that as Volkmann observes (*Rhetorik*², p. 28), Dionysius as a technical rhetorician harks back to Isocrates, it is at least quite possible that the Herodotean tale of Gyges entered the scholastic tradition of rhetoric at some time between Isocrates and Dionysius.

At any rate—and, after all, that is enough for our present purpose—it actually does appear in a rhetorical treatise of the Augustan Age. There it is used in connection with the claim that composition is more important than selection. This, too, must have been a traditional claim. At all events, it is one which this passage of Herodotus was peculiarly fitted to support, inasmuch as the biblical simplicity of the language used is such a marked contrast to the more or less rare and *recherché* vocabulary which was cultivated, for instance, by an author like Tacitus, and which was characteristic of rhetoric in general during and after the time of Dionysius himself. Indeed, although it is quite certain that Dionysius thoroughly believes in Herodotus, he, nevertheless, takes up the cudgels for him in a way that almost seems apologetic.⁷

(Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The Three Literary Letters*, p. 11, n. 1), "that, in this instance, the charm lies not so much in the dialect, or indeed in the vaunted *σύνθεσις* itself, as in the attitude of the writer's mind as revealed in the entire narrative, style being interesting (here if anywhere) as the revelation of personality." Roberts has a similar note in his *D. H. on Literary Composition*, pp. 84 sq., where he also bids the reader compare and contrast the narrative of Livy 39, 9.

⁷ Of course the Ionic dialect of Herodotus, as Dionysius himself must

This passage of Dionysius besides being of unusual importance in itself is also the only one, so far as I know, in which the Herodotean tale of Candaulus is used to illustrate a question of literary style. It will be observed that the portion of the story selected by Dionysius for discussion is the dialogue, not the narrative. This is entirely characteristic of rhetorical training in the schools. It is, therefore, no surprise to find that later references, in so far as they are scholastic in origin, are so largely confined to this particular portion of our story. But before considering these references, let us take up another important discussion of the story as a whole.

This belongs to the fifth century and is found in the *Progymnasmata* of the sophist Nikolaus. Long before the time of

have felt, undoubtedly does have a charm of its own, especially in a story like this. If we distrusted our own judgment, we might appeal to such ancient critics as Quintilian, 9, 4, 18, and Hermogenes, *De Ideis*, 362, 14 Spengel (cp. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, p. 36). We may grant perhaps that *σύνθεσις* as Dionysius defines it is superior to selection. We may even grant that his experiment on our passage of Herodotus has proved it. Nevertheless the fact still remains that he has failed to prove that the charm of the story is not due to the dialect. The reason—though he himself was apparently quite unaware of the fact—was because neither he nor anyone else could get rid of the Ionic dialect merely “by changing its distinctive forms into Attic, and without any further meddling with the language giving the conversation as it stands.”

In its form, as well as in its associations, the Ionic dialect has the dignity, the harmony, the flexibility of the old Epic. Ionic prose is not primitive in the sense of being inartistic. But it is old. Artistically as well as chronologically it is anterior to Attic prose. The same is true of the *λέξις εἰρομένη*, the type of literary composition—or, as Dionysius would call it, *σύνθεσις*—of which Herodotus has always been the great classical exemplar. *Ἡ μὲν οὖν εἰρομένη λέξις*, says Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3, 9, *ἡ ἀρχαία ἐστίν· Ἡροδότου Θουρίου ἢ δ' ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξις· ταύτη γὰρ πρότερον μὲν ἅπαντες, νῦν δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ χρώνται.* “The *λέξις εἰρομένη* is the ancient type . . . formerly it was used by everyone, now by comparatively few.” In short, to state it in a slightly different fashion, Aristotle means that the *λέξις εἰρομένη*—or, as Dionysius might have said, the type of *σύνθεσις* which suggested that term—is eminently characteristic of Ionic prose as opposed to later Attic prose. Anyone who is really acquainted with a modern dialect at first hand, knows that it is characterized by its arrangement of thought quite as much as by its vocabulary. For the whole question of the *λέξις εἰρομένη* as developed by Herodotus for his special purpose, see Jacoby s. v. “Herodotus” in *PRE*, Suppl. II.

Nikolaus, *προγυμνάσματα* had assumed a very important place in the scheme of education (see above, pp. 2 sq.). Among the most interesting were the practice declamations, more particularly the so-called *ἀνασκευαί* or confutations (Quintilian 2, 4, 18 etc.). These were given the young students and were supposed to be learned by them. The third in the collection of Nikolaus (Rhet. Graeci, I 287 Walz) is entitled:

Ὅτι οὐκ εἰκότα τὰ κατὰ Κανδαύλην

“That the story of Candaules is not credible.”

“There was a time when I had a wonderful opinion of historians as compared with poets; for the object of history is truth, the object of poetry is stories. But now it seems to me that Herodotus differs in no respect from the poets; for he obliterates the distinction between the two, and consequently preserves neither the charm of the metre nor the truth of history. One might criticize him for many things, but especially for the story he has told about Candaules. It runs as follows: Candaules, he says, who was a descendant of Hercules and in love with his own wife, exhibited her to Gyges. For he took Gyges with him into his own palace, stationed him behind the bedroom door, and gave him the opportunity of witnessing the Queen from there. She was aware that he saw her and was highly incensed; but she waited until morning, sent for Gyges and gave him the choice of two things—either to slay Candaules, or if he shrank from it, to be slain himself. Gyges chose to survive, Candaules fell, and marriage with his wife was the reward given for his murder.”

“This is the story as Herodotus tells it. All the statements in it can be picked to pieces in regular order. ‘Candaules is the descendant of Hercules.’ What indications of that pedigree are brought forward? The energy and ambition of Hercules were all in the direction of virtue and his deeds saved Greece; but Candaules had an eye only for pleasures. If he were a descendant of Hercules, how could he so belie his ancestry? How again could Candaules be in love with his own wife? For either he did not live with her or else he did live with her and therefore did not desire her; for intercourse destroys love, and the impulse of desire is killed by marriage. How too could he take Gyges into his palace? The palace was full of guards and crowded with people in every direction. Gyges would, therefore, be dragged off to execution before the King got him to the place proposed, and the trick would come to nought before Gyges saw the woman. And where in those rooms was he stationed for the view? Why, behind the door! If so, he would have escaped notice and therefore would not have seen her. For that which

is hidden from people is itself the first to escape notice. How could he see the woman naked? It was not the custom among the Lydians to strip oneself. Not even the men went without some covering, least of all the women. And why should a woman who is merely going to bed take off all her clothes? Women who derive an income from their favours, even if they were to strip themselves before men, would do so for the purpose of inspiring them with passion. Women who are chaste in their intercourse do not bring themselves to strip for the benefit of their husbands. How then could Gyges be present and look at a woman who, even to begin with, had not intended to take off all her clothes? Why did the woman send for Gyges and give him the choice of marriage, if she could not bear his seeing her, and why did she honor as a husband him whom she shrank from having as a spectator at such a time? How could she deliver the kingdom of the Lydians into his hands? Kings are chosen by peoples and by states. I really fail to see then how in the opinion of Herodotus a woman chooses a king and aspires to a fortune which a whole army does not confer. Herodotus ought not to have said these things and such things as these. And when he does say them, all we can do is to disbelieve him."

This *confutatio* is carefully worked out in accordance with the rules given for this type of composition by the sophist Theon (*Rhet. Graeci* I, p. 216 Walz). Some of the arguments touch on themes which had long been familiar to the schools. The reference to the virtue of Hercules, for instance, suggests a discussion which had seldom had an opportunity to rest since the time of Prodicus himself. It has no great value as an argument here, in fact none of the arguments presented here will impress the modern reader as of any great value. Nor indeed did they make any deep impression at that time. Herodotus had long since attained the position of a more or less impeccable classic and therefore no argument against him was taken very seriously. But this had not always been the case. Note, for example, that of all the themes used for *confutationes* by both Theon and Nikolaus, this is the only one taken from history. The rest are all taken from mythology. This in itself would suggest that there was a long tradition of adverse criticism of Herodotus with which the world was fairly familiar. We know that such was actually the case, although little is now left of it except Plutarch's essay *De Herodoti Malignitate*. This essay was written by a great man and one who was evidently more nearly in touch than was Theon with a living tradition of

the subject; but when it comes to the arguments presented, there is little to choose between the two.

Another version of our story as a whole is found in the section given to *διηγήματα* or rhetorical narrations in the *Progymnasmata* attributed to Libanius (vol. VIII, p. 43 F). The text is as follows:

**Ἦρα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὸς ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ παρεκάλει τὸν Γύγην ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν τῆς ὥρας. ὁ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον ἀρνούμενος ἐγκειμένου τοῦ Κανδαύλου συνεχώρησεν. ὕφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ καταστὰς ὅπισθεν τῆς θύρας τὴν γυναῖκα καταγυνομυμένην ἰδὼν ἀπηλλάγη. ἡ δὲ μεταστραφείσα τὸ πραχθὲν οὐκ ἠγνόησεν, ἤνεγκε δὲ σιγῇ. μεταπέμπεται δὲ τὸν Γύγην, ἐπειδὴ ἡμέρα ἦν, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν ἀποθνήσκειν ἀντὶ τῆς θέας ἣ τοῦτο δρᾶν τὸν Κανδαύλην ὑπισχνουμένη συνοικήσειν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸν φόνον. τὸν Γύγην ἤρεσκε μὲν οὐδέτερον, εἰς δὲ τὸ κτείνειν ἀπέκλινε. καὶ διαχρησάμενος καθεύδοντα τὸν δεσπότην γαμῆι τε ἐκείνην καὶ βασιλεύει Λυδῶν.*

The version of the scholiast on *Ælius Aristides*, XLV, 56 (III, p. 411 Dindorf) was, so to speak, a mere matter of business, but it is a good example of the type of rhetorical narratio just quoted:

Κανδαύλης Λυδῶν ἦν βασιλεὺς, παγκάλην ἔχων γυναῖκα. νόμον δὲ ὄντος, μὴ τινα τῶν ἑξωθεν ὁρᾶν τὰς βασιλίδας, ὁ Κανδαύλης ἐνέκειτο βιάζων τὸν Γύγην εἰς θέαν τῆς γυναικός, ὑπέρετην ὄντα αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ τὴν μὲν πρώτην ἀπεπήδα, χρόνῳ δὲ ὑπείξας τῷ Κανδαύλῃ βιάζοντι, καὶ εἶδε τὴν αὐτοῦ δέσποιναν. αὕτη οὖν λάθρα τουτονὶ μεταστελαμένη, ἣ θνήσκειν αὐτόν, ἣ κτείνειν τὸν δεσπότην ἔλεγε. καὶ ὃς αἰρεῖται τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ταύτην γαμήσας βασιλεύει Λυδῶν.

We have next to consider the political verses of *Ioannes Tzetzes*, *Chiliades*, I 137-166 and VII 195-202, the text of which has already been given above.

Finally, and this is almost the last word in ancient literature, *Georgios* (born 1241), later known as *Patriarch Gregorios*, who, it seems, was deeply interested in elementary education, composed a school-book (preserved in *Harleianus* 5735 and other MSS). True to the pedagogical tradition which had prevailed for more than a millennium, it consists of a prose paraphrase of *Æsopic* fables, and some mythological pieces, among the rest the story of *Iphigenia*, of *Æneas*, of *Pandarus* and *Diomedes*, and of *Candaules* and *Gyges*. (See *Krumbacher*, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d. edit., Munich, 1897, p. 477.) The persistence of our story at this late date shows in itself that it had long been familiar to the schools. How familiar it was,

and how persistent the scholastic tradition of it was, is shown by the fact that so far as rhetorical narrations are concerned, it is one of the rare exceptions to the rule of a mythological rather than a historical or quasi-historical subject. In the forty-odd narrations of Libanius, for example, this story and two others are the only exceptions. Even in the confutations and refutations of Theon and his successors, the same rule holds good.

Such is the tradition of the entire story. It was characteristic, persistent and, so far as we can see, entirely scholastic. But this was only one aspect of the tradition. The passage, for example, in Ptolemæus Chennus (p. 192 W), already referred to above, shows that the Herodotean tale of Gyges was quite as much a subject of literary chit-chat in the First Century as was Plato's story of the Ring. It follows, therefore, that it had long been familiar to the Rhetorical Schools.

But the longest and perhaps the most important chapter in the tradition of this passage is concerned with two phrases. Both are found in the dialogue between Gyges and Candaules. The fact also that they are both sententious explains why they, and incidentally the dialogue in which they occur, were referred to so much oftener in the later tradition than anything else in the story. One of the notable features in the growth of rhetoric and rhetorical study under the Empire was the increasing fondness for *sententiæ*—using that word in the sense of sayings of general application—sometimes proverbial but not necessarily so.⁸ Tacitus, as everyone knows, is famous for them and, as we shall see later, Herodotus was greatly admired for his skill in making them spring naturally from the context.

Turning now to the first of the two phrases which we have to consider, Herodotus makes Candaules say, "Gyges, when I tell thee of my wife's beauty, methinks thou dost not believe me (in fact men's ears are naturally less trustworthy than their eyes). *ὅτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἔόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν*. "Seeing is believing," to use the parallel phrase in English. The thought was of course not new. Indeed, the artistic value and fitness of it in this particular connection are due to the fact not

⁸ Ernesti, *Lex. Techn.* s. v.; Seneca, *Controv.* I, *Praef.*; Quint. IV 2, 121; Theon, I, p. 200 W.

only that it was not new but that it was a commonplace familiar to everyone.

So far as Greece is concerned, however, the only notable occurrence of the thought, before Herodotus, seems to be in a fragment of Heraclitus quoted by Polybius 12, 27, 1.⁹ The passage reads:

δυνεῖν γὰρ ὄντων κατὰ φύσιν ὥσανεί τινων ὀργάνων ἡμῖν, οἷς πάντα πυθανόμεθα καὶ πολυπραγμονούμεν, ἀκοῆς καὶ ὁράσεως, ἀληθινωτέρας δ' οὐσης οὐ μικρῇ τῆς ὁράσεως κατὰ τὸν Ἡράκλειτον· ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ τῶν ὥτων ἀκριβέστεροι μάρτυρες· Ἡράκλειτον here was changed to Ἡρόδοτον by Leutsch, etc., but Ἡράκλειτον is the reading of the MSS, and there is no good reason for doubting it.

Sophocles, *Œd. Tyr.* 1237,

αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτῆς. τῶν δὲ πραχθέντων τὰ μὲν
ἀλγιστ' ἀπεστίν· ἡ γὰρ ὄψις οὐ πάρα,

though sometimes quoted in this connection, is hardly parallel.

Latin cognates are fairly numerous,¹⁰ but the only passage which one might suspect of being an echo of the Herodotean phrase is Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 180:

Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus, et quae
Ipse sibi tradit spectator.

On the Greek side, it is again Dionysius of Halicarnassus—if indeed Dionysius is the author of the following passage—who furnishes the first reference, *Rhetoric*, 11, p. 401:¹¹

Furthermore, figures of speech also indicate the distinctive quality of the barbarian mind, as was undoubtedly the case when Herodotus makes Candaules say to Gyges in the course of his

⁹ *Frag. XV* Bywater; *frag. 101a* Diels. See Diels' note and especially R. von Scala, *Studien des Polybios*, Stuttgart, 1890, I, pp. 88 ff.

¹⁰ Plautus, *Asin.* 202: *Semper oculatae manus sunt nostrae, credunt quod vident*; Plautus, *Truc.* 490 (also quoted by Apuleius, *Flor.* 2 and Festus, 179 M): *Pluris est oculatus testis unus quam auriti decem*; Terence, *Eun.* 350: *Vidi, novi*; Seneca, *N. Q.*, 4, 3, 1: *Itaque ex his me testibus numero secundae notae, qui audivisse quidem se, vidisse negant*, etc.; Seneca, *Epist.* 6, 5: *Homines amplius oculis quam auribus credunt*; Hieronymus, *Epist.* 64, 10: *Multoque plus intellegitur quod oculis videtur quam quod aure percipitur*. Cicero, *De Orat.* 3, 161, though quoted in this connection, is not in point.

¹¹ I doubt whether Strabo 2, 5, p. 117 is in any sense an echo of Herodotus.

conversation with him: "In fact, men's ears are naturally less trustworthy than their eyes." For he did not speak of 'hearing' and 'sight,' but transferred the thought to the parts of the body concerned.

It is quite true that a large use of figurative speech, especially in ordinary conversation, is more or less characteristic of the barbarian mind. But the long tradition of this particular use in Greek itself, beginning as we have seen as early at least as Heraclitus, suggests that Dionysius might have done better to select some other example. This, however, is a point with which we are not directly concerned.

Chronologically the first to consider after Dionysius is Philo Judaeus. He displays an extraordinary fondness for this thought, but, after a careful examination of his entire works, I can give no example which seems to be suggested by our phrase.

We now come to Lucian—in the discussion of a question like this always an author of unusual interest. Perhaps no late writer had a wider range of reading, certainly no one could make a more felicitous use, if he chose, of literary tradition. In this period of the first Sophistic Renaissance special attention, as we have already seen, was given to Herodotus. The passage from Nikolaus discussed above indicates that Herodotus in general and his stories of Cræsus and of Candaules in particular were firmly rooted in the schools. We gather from Lucian how familiar they must have been to the reading public—all of whom had been educated in those schools. An excellent example of Lucian's methods of dealing with Herodotean material is found in his *De Domo*, 19 ff. His description of the handsome building naturally brings up the question of the superiority of seeing to hearing. Lucian defends the former against an assumed opponent whom he calls *ὁ λόγος*. In the passage with which we are concerned Lucian says:

"Compare the story of the Sirens with that of the Gorgons, if you would know how insignificant is the power of words in comparison with that of visible objects. The enchantments of the former were at the best a matter of time; they did but flatter the ear with pleasing songs; if the mariner landed, he remained long on their hands, and it has even happened to them to be disregarded altogether. But the beauty of the Gorgons, irresistible in might, won its way to the inmost soul, and wrought amazement and dumbness in the beholder; admiration

(so the legend goes) turned him to stone. All that my opponent has just said about the peacock illustrates my point: that bird charms not the ear, but the eye. Take a swan, take a nightingale, and set her singing: now put a silent peacock at her side, and I will tell you which bird has the attention of the company. The songstress may go hang now; so invincible a thing is the pleasure of the eyes. Shall I call evidence? A sage, then, shall be my witness, how far mightier are the things of the eye than those of the ear. Usher, call me Herodotus, son of Lyxes, of Halicarnassus.—Ah, since he has been so obliging as to hear the summons, let him step into the box. You will excuse the Ionic dialect; it is his way.

“Gentlemen of the Jury, the Theory hath spoken sooth. Give good heed to that he saith, how sight is a better thing than hearing; for a man shall sooner trust his eyes than his ears.”

“You hear him, Gentlemen? He gives the preference to sight, and rightly. For words have wings; they are no sooner out of the mouth than they take flight and are lost; but the delight of the eyes is ever present, ever draws the beholder to itself. Judge, then, the difficulty the orator must experience in contending with such a rival as this Hall, whose beauty attracts every eye.” [Fowler’s trans.]

Again in his *De Saltatione*, 78, an essay in which it is several times suggested that pantomime appeals both to the ear and the eye, Lucian says:

“The eyes, according to Herodotus, are more credible witnesses than the ears; though the pantomime, by the way, appeals to both kinds of evidence.”

Finally, in his amusing essay on *The Way to Write History*, 29, he says:

“Another entertaining person, who has never set foot outside of Corinth, nor travelled as far as its harbour—not to mention seeing Syria or Armenia—starts with words which impressed themselves on my memory: ‘Seeing is believing’: *Ὦτα ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπιστότερα*. I therefore write what I have seen, not what I have heard.”

It will be noticed that no author is mentioned here, but we may be quite sure that both Lucian and the majority of his readers thought of Herodotus.

The next example on my list belongs to the second Sophistic Renaissance. In a letter to Leontius (XXI, *Epistolog. Graeci*, p. 345, 45, Didot) the Emperor Julian begins an attack on his correspondent with

"The historian from Thurii says that 'men's ears are less trustworthy than their eyes.' So far as you are concerned, I hold the opposite opinion."

Again, in one of his speeches (4, 145 D) he says:

"Since the eyes are more trustworthy than the hearing though they are less trustworthy and weaker than the understanding, come let us endeavor," etc.

An unexpected and interesting application of our phrase is made by Libanius, Declam. 30, 53 (VI, p. 647 F). The envious man complains that his neighbor's handsome house is more than he can bear to look upon:

ἀμυδρὰν ἔχει τὰ ὤτα τὴν λύπην, διὰ δὲ τῶν ὀμμάτων ὀξείᾳ τις ὁδὴν κάτεισιν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν. ὁρᾶν δὲ καὶ μὴ βουλόμενον ἀνάγκη.¹²

Two generations later the ecclesiastic Theodoretus (Graec. Aff. Cur. 10, 103), discussing prophecy and emphasizing the fact that as a basis of belief seeing surpasses hearing, closes with the remark:

"And Herodotus cleverly tells us that men's ears are less trustworthy than their eyes. For the eyes of course see what the ears hear."

A scholiast on Aratus says in his Introduction [p. 89, Maass]:

Καλὸν κατὰ τὸν Κυρρηαῖον [Callimachus, Epig. 27] ἀμείψασθαι τῷ λόγῳ τὸν Ἀράτου πόνον, ὃν ἐπόνησεν

ἡμενος (οὐδέ οἱ ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔπιπτεν ·

Πηλιάδας εἰσορόωντι καὶ ὁψὲ δύνοντα Βωώτην

* Ἀρκτον θ', ἣν καὶ Ἀμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησιν καλέουσιν)

ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἰθακήσιον κυβερνήτην (Odyss. 5, 271-3) · τῷ μὲν γὰρ Ἀλικαρνασσεῖ (Herod. 1, 8) ὤτα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν τυγχάνει, Ἄρατος δὲ τὴν μάθησιν ἅμα τοῖς ὤσιν ἐπιδείκνυσιν τοῖς ὁμμασιν.

The Scholia Veneta (Homer, Il. T, 292) give the thought; but no necessary suggestion of an echo of Herodotus is to be detected either here or in the following passage from Theophylactus Simocatta, Dial. 10, 1 [vol. I, p. 177 Ideler]:

¹² We cannot say that there is an echo of Herodotus in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitiones, III 44, where in a supposed argument between Peter and Simon Magus we have: Which of the two can better persuade an incredulous man, seeing or hearing? Then Simon said: "Seeing."

ταῖς φιλοπευθέσι ψυχαῖς κόρος οὐκ ἔστι γνώσεως. οὐκοῦν ἐπὶ τὴν νύσαν ὁ λόγος, Ἀντίσθενες. ὧτα γάρ μοι ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπληστότερα.

Finally, Apostolius XVIII, 71, Par. Graeci, II, p. 744, sets down ὥτιον πιστότεροι ὀφθαλμοί in his collection of proverbs and offers the following grammatical explanation in his note:

ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλόγως τὰ μείω τοῖς κρείττοσι παραβαλλομένων. ἰστέον δ' ἂν σοι εἴη, ὥς τὸ ἀκούω οὐ μόνον γενικῇ ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰτιατικῇ συντάσσεται, ὥς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα κατηγορήματα τῶν αἰσθήσεων πλὴν τῆς ὀράσεως· ἐκείνη γὰρ μόνῃ αἰτιατικῇ ἅτε βασιλικωτέρα τῶν ἄλλων οὔσα καὶ ἐφ' ἐνὸς ἰδρῆσθαι μόνον προσήκουσα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄνω καὶ κάτω φέρεσθαι.¹³

The phrases collected by the Paroemiographi are not always proverbs in the strict sense of the word. On the contrary, the collection is more often a cross between Bartlett's 'Familiar Quotations' and Fumagalli's 'Chi l'ha detto?' The phrase, however, not only sounds like a genuine proverb but differs from Herodotus in the arrangement of the thought. ὥτιον πιστότεροι ὀφθαλμοί would be the natural statement of the idea in Greek. Herodotus states it as 'ears less trustworthy than eyes' because the reversal, so to speak, is more in harmony with his context.

The history of this phrase, as will be seen from the survey just given, has a certain interest and significance of its own. When Herodotus used it, it had long been a commonplace, almost a proverb. Indeed, it was for that very reason that he did use it. But as early at least as the second century of our era it was so thoroughly identified with the Herodotean account of Candaules that it had assumed the character of a definite literary allusion. The principal, if not the only, reason for it was the fact that this particular passage was carefully studied in the Rhetorical Schools.

To the same cause may be traced the long vitality of another phrase in our story. This is the statement of Gyges in his reply to Candaules that "woman, in putting off her raiment, also putteth off her respect": ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένη συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γυνή. Like its predecessor just discussed and for the same reason, this also should be a commonplace. That this actu-

¹³ Cf. Ap. Dysc. *περὶ συντάξεως* 290, 10 sqq. (Bekker) and B. L. Gildersleeve, *A Syntactician among the Psychologists*, *Journ. Philos. Psychol. and Scientific Methods*, II 93.—C. W. E. M.

ally was the case is shown by the famous saying which Diogenes Laertius attributes to Theano the wife of Pythagoras (8, 1, 43):

“She advised the woman intending to go to her own husband to put off her modesty together with her garments, and when she arose to put it on again with them”: *τῇ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα μελλούσῃ πορεύεσθαι παρῆναι ἅμα τοῖς ἐνδύμασι καὶ τὴν αἰσχύνην ἀποτίθεσθαι, ἀνίσταμένην τε πάλιν ἅμα αὐτοῖσιν ἀναλαμβάνειν.*

This in itself presupposes the existence even in Theano's time of the commonplace which long afterwards Herodotus put in the mouth of Gyges.

The same commonplace seems to have suggested the same discussion and the same conclusion to Plutarch. In the *Coniug. Praecepta*, 10, 139 C, he observes that

“Herodotus is not correct in saying that a woman lays off her modesty together with her raiment. On the contrary, the chaste woman puts on modesty instead,” etc.

Here, as with the phrase previously discussed, the attribution to Herodotus of what, in substance at least, was an ancient commonplace indicates how firmly his tale of Gyges was fixed in the literary tradition. Cp., also, Plutarch, *De audiendo*, 1.

We have already seen that the story was studied in the Rhetorical Schools of the second century. In this connection it is interesting to observe that while discussing the use of *sententiæ*, which he says should spring naturally from the context, Theon (I, p. 200 Walz) quotes two from Herodotus—one from the story of Cræsus, the other, our phrase, from the story of Gyges. Such being the case, the phrase must have been doubly and trebly familiar in later times. And that this was the case is also suggested by the fact that it occurs no less than twice in the *Florilegium* of Stobaeus—32, 8, and again, more correctly, in 74, 36.

In his *Pædagogus* II, 10, 100 (I, p. 299 Dindorf), Clemens Alexandrinus says:

ἀεὶ δὲ καθαρῷ καθαροῦ θέμις θυγαίνειν· μὴ δὲ ἅμα χιτῶνι ἀποδυμένῳ ἀποδυσάμεθα καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ ποτε, ἐπεὶ οὐδέποτε τῷ δικαίῳ σφροσύνην ἀποδύσασθαι θέμις.

The Scholiast (p. 444) on this passage quotes the Herodotean phrase.

Clement was one of the best educated as well as one of the most gifted of the Church Fathers. The same cannot be said of Theodoretus, whose reference to the phrase regarding eyes and ears has already been noted. In his *Graec. Affect. Curatio* 9, 42, he quotes the following passage from Plato (*Leg. XI* 925 A) :

τὴν δὲ τοῦ τῶν γάμων χρόνου συμμετρίαν τε καὶ ἀμετρίαν ὁ δικαστὴς σκοπῶν κρινέτω, γυμνοὺς μὲν τοὺς ἄρρενας, γυμνὰς δὲ ὀμφαλοῦ μέχρῃ θεώμενος τὰς θηλείας.

After which the worthy ecclesiastic allows himself to remark impressively that

“The one who made these laws did not remember the words of the wife of Candaules. For when her husband bade her show her naked body to him, she said very chastely that a woman in putting off her raiment at the same time put off her modesty.”

Theodoretus gets many of his quotations from the classics indirectly through Eusebius and others. This, however, is one which his latest editor counts among those secured at first hand. If so, Theodoretus must have had a very poor memory. I, myself, should be inclined to believe that he had a fair memory of the phrase, because he had learned it in school, but only a vague recollection of the story in which it was found.

This completes the ancient history of our phrase, so far as I have been able to trace it. As regards the sentiment expressed, it is to be observed that Dionysius does not consider it as specifically barbarian—in spite of the fact that Herodotus himself further down felt called upon to explain the resentment of the Queen by stating that “among the Lydians, and nearly all the other barbarians, even for a man to be seen naked is reckoned a deep disgrace.”

As a matter of fact, the standard of modesty is much more a matter of convention than is generally supposed. It varies more or less according to race, period, etc. Nothing is better known to the modern world than the attitude of the Greeks on this subject, as set forth in the statement of Herodotus just quoted; cf. also Plato, *Resp.* 452 C, and Philostratus, *Imagines* I, 30. But the attitude of the nation, even if truthfully stated, is not necessarily the attitude of the individual. One Lysidice, as described by Dio the philosopher (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* 4, 19,

120), would have been unusual even in the severest years of the Victorian Age:

Ναὶ μὴν Δίῳν ὁ φιλόσοφος Λυσιδίκην τινὰ γυναῖκα ἱστορεῖ δι' ὑπερβολὴν αἰδοῦς αὐτῷ χιτῶνι λούεσθαι, Φιλωτέραν δέ, ὅποτε μέλλοι εἰσιέναι τὴν πύelon, ἥσυχῇ ἐπαναστέλλεσθαι τὸν χιτῶνα καθ' ὅσον τὰ γυμνά τὸ ὕδωρ ἔσκεπεν, εἶτα κατ' ὀλίγον αὖθις ἀνιοῦσαν ἐπενδύσασθαι.

And we may be sure that there never was a time in any country when a woman of character would not have resented bitterly the treatment which Candaules accorded his queen.

One more phrase remains to be considered before proceeding to other matters. This is *χρῆν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς*. It is not a sententia. The remarkable vitality of it is rather due to the fact that it is so eminently characteristic of Greek in general and of Herodotus in particular. It is a homely expression of that idea of Nemesis, or balance, which was so firmly fixed in the antique mind and so characteristic of antique thought. The Tragedy could hardly have existed without it, and, as for Herodotus, his entire book is one long lesson in it. The story of Candaules and the story of Croesus are conspicuous examples of it, but there are others; and in fact Herodotus makes the same comment no less than four times elsewhere (2, 161; 4, 79; 5, 92 d; 9, 109). Nevertheless, and here again scholastic rhetoric was undoubtedly the carrier, this phrase was not only felt to be distinctively Herodotean, but it was regularly associated with his story of Candaules. That this was the case is shown by Lucian in his *Asinus* 28. Relating the story of his adventures and mishaps in the form of an ass, the hero says at this point:

“But when we went to the field, the herdsman mingled me with the horses and led us to the herd for pasture. And really after that it was written that I should fare as did Candaules; for the overseer of the horses left me behind in the hands of his wife Megapole, and she harnessed me to the mill,” etc.

The sentence in question is: *ἐχρῆν δὲ ἄρα κἀνταῦθα ὥσπερ Κανδαύλῃ καμοὶ γενέσθαι*. What is the solution of the puzzle? The old scholar Wesselingius said, supply *κακῶς*. This of course is correct. That it should be so shows in itself how familiar the Herodotean version was to the contemporary reading public.

Again, in his essay on *The Way to Write History*, Lucian says (18):

"Again, it would be a sinful neglect to omit the man who begins like this: 'I devise to tell of Romans and Persians'; then a little later, 'For 'twas Heaven's decree that the Persians should suffer evils'; ἔδεε γὰρ Πέρσῃσι γενέσθαι κακῶς; and again, 'One Osroes there was, whom Hellenes name Oxyroes'—and much more in that style. He corresponds, you see, to one of my previous examples; only he is a second Herodotus, and the other a second Thucydides."

An epigram of Agathias (A. P. VII 567):

Κανδαύλου τόδε σῆμα · Δίκη δ' ἐμὸν οἶτον ἰδοῦσα
οὐδὲν ἀλιτράνειν τὴν παράκοιτιν ἔφη.
ἦθελε γὰρ δισσοῖσιν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι μηδὲ φανῆναι,
ἀλλ' ἢ τὸν πρὶν ἔχειν, ἢ τὸν ἐπιστάμενον.
χρῆν ἄρα Κανδαύλην παθεῖν κακόν · οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔτλη
δείξαι τὴν ἰδίην ὄμμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις.

shows that the phrase was equally familiar to the public three hundred years later.

Finally, two examples are quoted from Procopius—one from the Bell. Pers. I 25, 26:

Ἰωάννης δὲ (χρῆν γὰρ αὐτῷ γενέσθαι κακῶς) τὴν βασιλέως ὑποθήκην
ἐν ἀλογία πεποιημένος,

the other from Bell. Goth. I 4, 4:

Ἀμαλασοῦνθα δὲ (χρῆν γὰρ οἱ γενέσθαι κακῶς) ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ φύσιν
τὴν Θεοδάτου ποιησάμενη.

It will be observed that in neither case does he appear to be conscious of making a quotation at all. But in view of what has been said above, we may be tolerably certain that he knew the phrase to be Herodotean.

But the tradition of this story is by no means confined to phrases alone. On the contrary, its use for other purposes is quite as noticeable. A case in point is the very idea of Nemesis illustrated by the phrase just discussed. In the Tragedy it generally appears in the form of Ate, or divine vengeance. In everyday life it appears as the ups and downs of fickle fortune, a subject of which the world at large never grew weary. The guests, for example, at Trimalchio's dinner table, most of whom are freedmen, discuss it as freely and eagerly as in the same situation we would wax enthusiastic over politics or our favorite dishes. Above all in the Rhetorical Schools, the presentation of this subject in various forms continued until the very end of

antiquity itself. The Tenth Satire of Juvenal, the Sixty-fourth Oration (De Fortuna) in the corpus of Dio Chrysostomus—and many others might be mentioned—are devoted entirely to this subject. Socrates, Cicero, Demosthenes, Priam, Alexander, Xerxes, Seianus, Pompey, Marius, Hannibal, Sardanapallus, Caesar, Mithridates—history and mythology were ransacked for striking examples, and most of them became commonplaces in the Rhetorical Schools. Few were so familiar and so notable as Xerxes, Croesus, and Candaules—all three furnished by Herodotus. We have seen how Candaules was treated by Herodotus. With him the story of Gyges becomes a great tragedy of destiny. In Justinus, Candaules has already become a mere illustration of the theme so long familiar to the Rhetorical Schools. “Fuere Lydis,” says Justinus at the very beginning of his account, “multi ante Croesum reges variis casibus memorabiles, nullus tamen fortunae Candauli comparandus” (I 7, 14).

Another characteristic method of dealing with this theme is furnished by [Dio Chrysostomus] De Fortuna, LXIV 27:

θησαυροὶ μὲν εἰς ἀνθρώπους οὗτοι παρὰ θεοῖς · ταμιεύει δὲ αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἢ τύχη καὶ ῥήτορι καὶ στρατηγῷ καὶ πένητι καὶ πλουσίῳ καὶ πρεσβύτῃ καὶ νέῳ. Κροίσῳ δίδωσι χρυσόν, Κανδαύλῃ γυναῖκα, Πηλεΐ ξίφος, Νέστορι ἄσπιδα, Πτερέλῃ κόμην χρυσῆν, Νίσῳ πλόκαμον πορφυροῦν, Ἀλκιβιάδῃ κάλλος, Σωκράτει φρόνησιν, Ἀριστείδῃ δικαιοσύνην, Λακεδαιμονίοις γῆν, Ἀθηναίοις θάλατταν. εἶτα ἐν μέρει τούτων μὲν ἀφείλετο, ἄλλοις δὲ ἔδωκεν. καὶ οὐδέν μοι δοκεῖ ὁ βίος τῶν ἀνθρώπων πομπῆς διαφέρειν ἐν ταῖς ἡμερησίοις μεταβολαῖς.

In Justinus as well as in Herodotus, the visible instrument of Destiny is the woman. She is the evil genius of the doomed king. Viewed from this angle, Candaules was called upon to illustrate another theme, which not only in the Rhetorical Schools but in the world at large has been familiar ever since the temptation of Eve. This is the assertion that the greatest enemy of mankind is womankind. As the old English etymologer has it, “woman is woe-man.” The most striking example of this for our purpose is furnished by Achilles Tatius I 8. In this passage Clinias, hearing that his friend is about to be married, attempts to dissuade him from it by citing a number of dreadful examples, among the rest,

“Eriphyle’s necklace, Philomela’s dinner, Sthenoboea’s lie,

Aërope's theft, Procne's murder. Agamemnon desired the beauty of Chryseis, Achilles that of Briseis—the one lover brought a plague upon the Greeks, the other mourning upon himself. Candaules married a beautiful wife; but by her he was slain."

The nature and peculiarities of love and lovers were much discussed in antiquity, especially by the philosophers and afterwards in the Rhetorical Schools. Most of us, for example, have met the man who insists on telling us all about his love-affair. The same man was quite as common in antiquity, and the standard example of him appears to have been Candaules.

Why does he insist on making Gyges his confidant? Because, says Herodotus, it was written that Candaules should come to ruin. Justinus says,

"Hic uxorem, quam propter formae pulchritudinem deperiebat, praedicare omnibus solebat, non contentus voluptatum suarum tacita conscientia, nisi etiam matrimonii reticenda publicaret, prorsus quasi silentium damnum pulchritudinis esset." "Exactly as though silence were a diminution of her beauty."

After all, the rhetorician has explained much in a single phrase. So, too, Plutarch in a discussion on love says (*Quaest. Conviv.* I 5, 6):

"And though they take the greatest delight in looking at those they love they take no less delight in praising them than in looking at them. And love, garrulous as it is anyhow, is extremely so in the matter of praises. For lovers are themselves thoroughly persuaded, and they wish everybody else to be thoroughly persuaded, that those whom they love are beautiful and good. This is what roused the Lydian Candaules to induce Gyges into his apartment as a spectator. . . . For they wish their statements supported by the testimony of others."

The attitude is familiar enough. Many illustrations of it might be quoted, cp. for example Tibullus IV 13, 7-8 with my note:

nil opus invidia est, procul absit gloria vulgi:
qui sapit, in tacito gaudeat ille sinu.¹⁴

"The act of Candaules in exhibiting his wife as described by Herodotus and Justinus is quite credible. There is no reason for disbelieving a similar story which Suetonius tells of Caligula (25): *Caesoniam neque facie insigni neque aetate integra matremque iam ex alio viro trium filiarum, sed luxuriae ac lasciviae perditae, et ardentius et con-*

But, after all, the feelings of Candaules and, which is not generally taken into account, the feelings of Gyges are perhaps best described in Suckling's song in which we are told that:

If, when Dan Cupid's dart
Doth wound a heart,
We hide our grief
And shun relief,
The smart increaseth on that score;
For wounds unsearcht but rankle more.

Then if we whine, look pale,
And tell our tale,
Men are in pain
For us again;
So, neither speaking doth become
The lover's state, nor being dumb.

When this I do descry
Then thus think I:
etc., etc.

stantius amavit, ut saepe chlamyde peltaque et galea ornatam ac iuxta adequitantem militibus ostenderit, amicis vero etiam nudam. uxorio nomine dignatus est tquam enixam, uno atque eodem die professus et maritum se eius et patrem infantis ex ea natae. Nor for that matter is the type unknown to the mediaeval *novelle* of France and Italy. As Radet says: "Il n'y a rien d'anormal à ce qu'un souverain d'Orient se soit enorgueilli de son harem. Tout au contraire. Ensuite, dans cette frénésie d'enchantement qu'inspire à Candaule une forme admirable, il se pourrait qu'à la vanité amoureuse se mêlât quelque sentiment esthétique. Hérodote n'est pas seul à présenter le Sandonide comme un amateur du beau, passionnément épris du charme des lignes et des contours. C'est bien une physionomie d'artiste que Plinie lui attribue [XXXV 34, 2; VII 39, 1; cf. VII 57, 14]. . . . Candaule eut, à n'en pas douter, le goût des arts, et ce fut très probablement ce dilettantisme qui donna lieu à la tradition populaire dont Hérodote s'est fait l'écho" (*La Lydie et le monde grec au temps des Mermnades*, Paris, 1893, p. 131). It is this type of man which Gautier drew with great care in his well-known story 'Le Roi Candaule,' and which Hebbel attempted though with less success in his once famous play, *Gyges und sein Ring*. C. Fries, *Oriental. Lit.-Ztg.* 1910, 346 f. (cp. Lehmann-Haupt PRE VII, p. 1966) shows clearly enough that in this particular at least the folly of Candaules is an echo not of his dilettantism but of the old story of Ishtar, the Babylonian Venus. So far as the ancients were concerned, everyone was quite well aware that the type represented by Candaules, Caligula and their kind is not, and never has been, surprisingly rare. In this type, mere overweening pride of ownership—the impulse that

Three passages remain to be considered. The first is found in the speech of Aelius Aristides in Defence of Rhetoric (Orat. XLV 56—II, p. 74 Dindorf).

"My opponents claim," he says in substance, "that rhetoric incites to crime. The claim is ridiculous. On the contrary, it holds up to reprobation as nothing else can. Let us take the case of Gyges and Candaules. οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' εἰ Πλάτων οἶεται τούτους ἐλέγχειν αὐτήν, ὥρα καὶ τὰ Γύγου τοῦ Λυδοῦ προσεγκαλεῖν αὐτῇ οἶμαι—ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ ἀτοπώτερα—ὅτι τὸν δεσπότην ἀποκτείνας ἔσχε τὴν ἀρχήν· ἡ δὲ συνήδει καὶ συνέπραττεν ἡ τοῦ μὲν γυνή, τοῦ δὲ δέσποινα."

In his funeral oration for the Emperor Julian (18, 294—II, p. 365 F), Libanius, after describing the ruin, the suffering, the desolation, which accompanied and followed the cruel and untimely death of his beloved friend and pupil, is moved, as well he may be, to inquire why such things are.

"It were nothing strange," he says in substance, "if in days like these any man might feel, as I feel, that never to die would be a penalty. And yet I did think that the gods ought to reward that marvelous man now gone, not with that penalty, but with children, with ripe old age, and length of dominion. They did not. On the other hand, there are the Lydian kings—all of them, my God, the seed of Gyges, him with the hands unclean. One of them reigned for thirty-nine years, another for fifty-seven; and he himself the impious guardsman for thirty-eight."

Again in Orat. 25, 69 (II 571 F), supporting his claim that slaves cannot be trusted, he says:

"A great many things teach me that lesson; among the rest, the Lydian guardsman who slew his master and took all he had, both his wife and his kingdom."

Note that the sentence ends much as does the concluding sentence of both Herodotus and Justinus.

These three passages are the only ones in which any emphasis whatever is laid upon the guilt of either Gyges or his accomplice. That this should be the case is a good illustration of the extraordinary conservatism of scholastic tradition.

It will be seen that so far as their later tradition is concerned, the experience of these two stories was much the same. Both of them lived in and by the schools. Even their Roman experi-

prompts the collector to exhibit some unique treasure, is quite sufficient in itself to explain the situation.

ence was parallel. There is no indication now that the passage of Herodotus was ever translated by any Roman, much less that it was ever known or used in the Roman schools. In fact, so far as I know, the Latin tradition of it begins and ends with the possible echo of a single phrase in Horace already discussed above. The only version of the story of Gyges to be found in Latin at all is by Justinus. It would be this version if any that would appear in the Roman schools. The story as Herodotus tells it is not calculated to appeal to the Roman mind, above all to the Roman professorial mind. The psychology of it is too unusual.

Now, of course, it would be ridiculous to assume from the testimony I have gathered that during all the long period from the death of Herodotus and Plato to the fall of the Eastern Empire there were not a great many people who read the two stories in question, quite apart from the fact that during all that time they appear to have been safely ensconced in the regular course of preliminary training which every educated man was supposed to have followed. Many people even in these days know more of Shakespeare and Milton than those selections which they were obliged to study when in college. The life of a great classic is by no means accurately gauged by the number of times it happens to be quoted or echoed in the later tradition of literary art. Nevertheless, the time always seems to come in the intellectual life of every nation when the classics are more talked about than read, when the only portions of them known at first hand are likely to be those which are included in the scheme of regular education, and therefore cannot be avoided or neglected. This investigation indicates, so far as it goes, that the last thousand years of the Graeco-Roman Empire were such a period. During all those centuries literary allusion to the great authors of the past often seems to be rich and varied. But when, among other things, we observe the regularity and the frequency with which certain stock phrases continue to recur, we realize that the richness and variety of such allusions are more apparent than real. Furthermore, if, following the method and scope of this investigation, we were to examine the pedigree of every such allusion and set aside all those that are clearly traceable to the schools, the residuum would hardly be visible, I suspect, to the naked eye.

As we have seen, thanks to the extraordinary conservatism and

vitality of scholastic training and apparently to them alone, the tradition of the two passages which we have been considering continued unbroken to the dawn of the Renaissance. With that great period of awakening and the return, after many ages, of the Greek Classics to the West, the life of our two passages like that of others loses scholastic support in the earlier sense, and thenceforth is to be traced for the most part in the literature of the modern languages. I subjoin here such references and echoes as I have happened to observe in the course of reading. Naturally a systematic and thorough search would reveal a great many more. Such as I have, however, are not without a certain interest and significance.

Let us first consider the story told by Plato. The earliest reference I have noticed to the ring of Gyges is found in Rabelais V 8: ¹⁵

Auquel iour Pantagruel requeroit instamment veoir Papegaut: mais Aeditue respondit, qu'il ne se laissoit ainsi facilement veoir. Comment, dist Pantagruel, a-il l'armet de Pluton en teste, l'anneau de Gygés és griffes, ou vn Chameleon en sein, pour se rendre inuisible au monde?

The reference to the Cap of Hades in this connection suggests that Rabelais drew his information directly from Plato not from Cicero's translation of the story. His statement with regard to the chameleon goes back to Pliny, XXVIII 115.

Later references belong for the most part to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

Guillaume Bouchet, *Les Serées*, vol. V, p. 20, Paris, Lemerre, 1881, in a discussion of the properties of various precious stones, says:

Et possible, adioustoit-il, que la pierre Siderite, dont nous parlons, se mouve naturellement au feu, comme l'Astriote se mouve dans le vinaigre, et font à croire à ceux qui regardent remuer ces pierres, que quelque esprit parle à eux, car quand nous ne pouvons rendre raison de quelque chose, et que la

¹⁵ Rings, jewels, and other charms conferring invisibility are frequently mentioned in mediaeval romances of chivalry and adventure. Most notable perhaps is the ring of Lunet (Chrestien de Troyes, *Yvain*, 1057 ff.). Lunet might have inherited it from Gyges; at all events, Chrestien was probably well acquainted with Cicero. But no definite connection can be shown.

Nature se peut cognoistre, tout incontinent nous iugeons y avoir en cela quelque divinité, ou quelque mistere occulte, dont on ne peut rendre raison, comme en l'Anneau de Gyges Roy des Lidiens, auquel y avoit vne pierre, qui avoit telle vertu que tournée vers luy, il voyoit tout ce qu'il vouloit, sans estre veu.

Du Bellay, *Les Amours*, XX:

Je souhaite plustost pour voir ce beau visage
Où le ciel a posé son plus parfaict ouvrage
L'anneau qui fait en Roy transformer un Berger.

Robert Greene (?), *Selimus*, line 2126:

We thought you had old Gyges' wondrous ring,
That so you were invisible to us.

Beaumont and Fletcher, *Fair Maid of the Inn*, I 1:

Why, did you think that you had Gyges' ring,
Or the herb that gives invisibility?

Ben Jonson, *New Inn*, I 1:

Fer. Because indeed I had
No medicine, sir, to go invisible,
No fernseed in my pocket nor an opal,
Wrought in bay leaf, in my left fist, to charm
Their eyes with.

Host. He does give you reasons, sir,
As round as Gyges' ring, which, say the ancients,
Was a hoop ring.

John Marston, *Satyres*, I 5; *Works*, ed. Bullen, III 263:

Tell me, brown Ruscus, hast thou Gyges' ring,
That thou presum'st as if thou wert unseen?

Id., *The Fawn*, III 1; *Works*, II 170:

What, did he think to walk invisibly before our eyes? And he had Gyges' ring I would find him.

George Chapman, *Monsieur d'Olive*, II 1 [London, Pearson, 1, p. 212]:

As private as I had King Gyges' ring
And could have gone invisible, yet saw all.

Id., *ibid.*, V 1 [p. 247]:

Let him enjoy the benefit of the enchanted ring, and stand a while invisible: at our best opportunity we'll discover him to the Duke.

Robert Herrick, *Hesperides*, begins his poem "Lovers how they come and part" with:

A Gyges ring they beare about them still,
To be, and not, seen when and where they will.

M. Delrio, *Disquisitiones Magicae*, Moguntiae, 1624, p. 186 :

Sic fraude daemonum Domitiani oculis se subtrahit Apollonius [apud] Philostratum, sic Gyges latebat fictitio illo tectus annulo apud Ciceronem, sic de Persei clypeo Graeculi fabulantur.

In her Artamène ou le Grand Cyrus (Paris, 1649-1653), Mlle de Scudéry makes one of her characters, the king of Pontus, possessor of the ring of Gyges. Mandane falls into his power but is finally rescued by the hero. See Dunlop-Wilson, II, p. 435 and note.

References in modern writers seem to turn up in unlikely places. For example, Mary Johnston, *Sir Mortimer*, 1904, p. 33, presumably imitating Lyly's euphuism, says :

Ulysses took Moly in his hand when there came to meet him Circe's gentlemen pensioners, and Gyges' ring not only saved him from peril but brought him wealth and great honor.

And we are told by Warwick Deeping, *Uther and Igraine*, 1903, p. 244, that :

Staunch sympathy like Gige's (*sic*) ring has power over most hidden things of the heart, and Gorlois was very human.

Finally, in Elinor Glyn's *Three Weeks*, p. 65, Paul's 'lady friend' tells him that :

We will rob Mercure (*sic*) of his sandals and Gyges of his ring.

Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, VII, chap. 18 :

If anyone makes a doubt of Giges' ring in Iustinus . . . for my part I shall not be angry with his incredulity.

The Doctor means Cicero, of course. The mistake is not uncommon.

On the whole—and, after all, this is quite natural—the story told by Herodotus seems to have made a deeper impression on the modern world than has the story of Plato. Herodotus was translated into French by Saliat in 1575 and into English by "B. R." (books I and II) in 1584; for his translation of this passage see Roberts' note on Dionysius of Halicarnassus on *Literary Composition*, London, 1910, pp. 82 ff. The story, however, had already been freely told after Herodotus by Painter in the sixth

tale of his "Pallace of Pleasure," 1566. Not far from the same date, Nicolao Granucci in his *Piacevol Notte, et Lieto Giorno*, Venetia, Vidali, 1574, p. 48 *verso*, speaking of the misfortunes of Croesus and their causes, retells the story of the king's ancestor, Gyges, as related by Herodotus.

Robert Greene, *The Carde of Fancie*, Works, ed. Grosart, vol. IV, p. 39, among many traditional examples cited of the woes that men suffer on account of women says:

Candaules was slaine by his murthering wife whom so intirelie he loued.

John Lyly, *Euphues*, vol. I, p. 210, Bond:

Tush, the case is lyght where reason taketh place; to love and to lyve well, is not graunted to Iupiter.¹⁶ Who so is blinded with the caule of beautie, decerneth no coulour of honestie. Did not Giges cut Candaules a coate by his owne measure?

In his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, III, p. 353 (Shilleto), speaking of the vagaries of lovers, Burton says:

In the other extreme some are too liberal, as the proverb is, *turdus ipse malum sibi cacat*, they made a rod for their own tails, as Candaules did to Gyges in Herodotus, commend his wife's beauty himself, and besides would needs have him see her naked.

In the old play of *Elvira* (Dodsley-Hazlitt, XV, p. 9) Digby says:

It were a wonder worthy of your wit,
To make me trust my ears before my eyes.

But neither this nor Lucretius V 100-103 is likely to have been an echo of the familiar Herodotean phrase.¹⁷

Such a line as

A happie starre made Giges ioie attaine

(*Paradise of Dayntie Devises*, p. 114, Collier), might have been suggested by either Plato or Herodotus, it is impossible to say which.

¹⁶ Bond forgets to mention in his note that this phrase is an echo of Publilius Syrus'

Amare et sapere vix deo conceditur.

¹⁷ Cp. Tennyson, *Enoch Arden*, 762, and see Mustard, *Classical Echoes* in Tennyson, p. 142.

Among imitations of Herodotus, the most notable perhaps is Lafontaine's conte, "Le Roi Candaule et le Maître en droit." Bouret's "L'Imprudence de Candaule," written at about the same time, is less known and not easily obtainable. I, therefore, subjoin the text here (*Anthologie Satyrique*, V, p. 51):

Jambe, genou, cuisse, téton, épaule,
 Tout en la reine est ouvrage parfait,
 Ami Gygès, disait un jour Candaule;
 Rien de plus beau la nature n'a fait.
 Sur son gent corps qui n'a rien qui ne plaise,
 Je voudrais bien savoir ton sentiment,
 Caché seras en lieu d'où bien à l'aise
 Apprécieras cet objet si charmant.
 Il tint parole. O le plus fou des hommes!
 Ton imprudence aveugle alla trop loin.
 Mais aux maris dans le siècle où nous sommes,
 Femmes l'on voit épargner un tel soin.

In both these versions, the attitude towards the characters is that of Justinus. It is the characteristic attitude of the Latin races.¹⁸

Baldassar Scaramelli (*Novelle*, Carmagnola, 1585) tells a story much like that of Herodotus or rather of Justinus. It is not likely, however, that it owes anything to either of them. The plot as stated by Scaramelli himself is as follows:

Un cavalier Pisano avendo per moglie la più bella donna di quel tempo, s'invoglia farla veder nuda a un suo lealissimo amico. Ella ciò nega, ond'egli a suo malgrado di nascosto fa vederla: del che la donna accortasi, dall'istesso che la vide fa godersi, e ciò per far dispetto al suo marito.

Modern versions of the story begin in the first half of the nineteenth century. The best known are Théophile Gautier's "Le Roi Candaule," a short story, and F. Hebbel's "Gyges und sein Ring," a tragedy. Less known, but an excellent piece of work, is Robert Lytton's narrative poem "Gyges and Candaules" (*Chronicles and Characters*, London, 1868, vol. I, p. 66). Equally good is "Gyges's Ring," a dramatic monologue, New York, 1901, the first published work, I believe, of Rupert

¹⁸ Brantôme, *Dames Galantes*, I, p. 64 (Jouaust), combines the two stories. The note ad loc. cites Cicero's version, but the source was Justinus and possibly Herodotus.

Hughes. André Gide's tragedy, "*Le Roi Candaule*," appeared in the same year. It is the last, and in some respects the best, of all the modern versions. Finally, I may mention, merely for the sake of completing the record, C. W. Lisle's "*Ring of Gyges, Some Passages in the Life of Francis Neville*," London, Bentley, 1886. The story seems to have been suggested more or less vaguely by a hasty reading, on the part of the author, of Gautier's version. Otherwise it is perhaps sufficiently described by the statement that it ought to, and probably did, belong to Mudie's Select Library of Fiction. At all events I, myself, never saw it but once. That was in the drawing-room of the vicarage in a village in the south of England.

By way of concluding this long investigation, I should like to call attention to two points which it illustrates and which, it seems to me, are so characteristic that they deserve to be mentioned here. The first is the extraordinary fidelity of Antiquity to type; the second is the difference between the ancient and modern way of considering and developing a story like this.

When Herodotus took this tale out of the irresponsible atmosphere of Fairy Land, he developed it on the lines of Greek tragedy. In fact, it is actually a parallel in prose to such dramas as the *Agamemnon* or the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. As such, the protagonist, the hero, is not Gyges; much less, is it the Queen; it is Candaules. The story, therefore, as Herodotus tells it, is not the Rise of Gyges, as it was in the old Fairy Tale, but the Fall of Candaules. Observe that in this respect the situation as it was in the old Fairy Tale is exactly reversed. On the other hand, the two are as nearly alike as possible in one important respect, viz., no particular blame, comparatively speaking, attaches to any of the characters. In the old folk tale this is due to the atmospheric effect of Fairy Land. Fairy Land is an utterly unmoral country. The adventurer, Gyges, and his accomplice, the Queen, outwit and destroy the brutal and foolish giant, Candaules; and the precious pair live happily ever after on the fruit of their combined labors. So, in Herodotus, the characters are all worthy of the situation. No one blames Candaules for a madness which the gods have sent upon him and which drives him to his doom as inexorably as it raises Gyges to his high estate. Even the Queen herself is only an instrument of Destiny. In other words, if Herodotus chose to

remould and rationalize the story on the lines of the Tragedy, it was because he believed that the old tradition depicting the characters as blameless actually reflected the truth. In this respect the tradition established by Herodotus lasted until the very end of antiquity. The three exceptions quoted on page 28 are more apparent than real. The first two were used by the speaker merely for the purpose of scoring a rhetorical point, and the third only as an illustration of what Barbey d'Aurevilly might have termed 'Le bonheur dans le crime.' Even Justinus does not depart altogether from the Herodotean conception. His story of Candaules, Gyges, and the Queen is the story of a fool and two knaves. But the fool is such an utter fool, that one can hardly blame either him for his folly or the knaves who profit by it.

Modern versions all differ from Herodotus in one respect. The protagonist is always Gyges, never Candaules. The queen, too, is much more prominent than she was in antiquity.

The effects of this difference are more subtle and far-reaching than at first sight they appear to be. As Herodotus tells the story, the theme is the folly of Candaules and its punishment. Candaules is an illustration of that mysterious and relentless power of Ate, which is so characteristic of the Tragedy and of the Hellenic conception of sin and its consequences. Did Candaules suffer for his own sin? Or for that of some ancestor? Who can tell? *Χρὴν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς* is all that Herodotus ventures to say. It is quite certain that every Greek who read the story of Herodotus, took it for granted that the curse did not and could not die with Candaules. Though caught in the net of relentless circumstances and driven as it were to execute perforce the decree of Destiny, Gyges and the Queen cannot go scot free. The curse lives on, and the day will surely come when they or their descendants must pay the bill in full.

For Herodotus, however, all this was subsidiary, and so much of it could be taken for granted that a passing reference was all that was necessary. Nevertheless, it is just this subsidiary portion that appeals to the essentially modern reader, and to which the modern writer when telling the same story has always given the greatest prominence. As we tell the tale, the hero is always Gyges, never Candaules.

On the whole, these modern versions have been remarkably

successful; but the psychology of the story, if Gyges is the hero, is more difficult and more complicated, and the artistic simplicity of Herodotus is altogether impossible. Nor is this the only difficulty. The fact is that some of the best stories in the world's literature are also the shortest. In most cases a page or two apiece is quite enough. Yet short as they are, they are told with such skill, they so fire the imagination of the reader, that it is often long before we realize that they always suffer by being retold at greater length or in more detail. Silvio Pellico, George Boker, Stephen Phillips, Gabriele d'Annunzio, and how many others have told at length the story of Francesca and Paolo. Which one of them would have told it at all, if it had not been for the immortal version of Dante? And Dante tells it in scarcely a dozen lines. If we could have but one of all these versions, which would we choose, and why? The tragedy of Candaules, as Herodotus wrote it, belongs to the same class. The story covers less than two pages. But this, too, is after all unique and unapproachable.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.